#### DOCUMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATOR DETERMINATION

Interim Final 2/5/99

#### **RCRA Corrective Action**

Environmental Indicator (EI) RCRIS code (CA750) Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control

Facility Name: Sunrise Medical Home Healthcare Group, Inc. (DeVilbis Company)

Facility Address: 100 DeVilbis Drive, Somerset, PA 15501

Facility EPA ID #: PAD 99 075 2537

1.	Has all available relevant/significant information on known and reasonably suspected releases to the
	groundwater media, subject to RCRA Corrective Action (e.g., from Solid Waste Management Units
	(SWMU), Regulated Units (RU), and Areas of Concern (AOC)), been considered in this EI determination?

X	If yes - check here and continue with #2 below.
	If no - re-evaluate existing data, or
	If data are not available, skip to #8 and enter"IN" (more information needed) status code

#### BACKGROUND

#### <u>Definition of Environmental Indicators (for the RCRA Corrective Action)</u>

Environmental Indicators (EI) are measures being used by the RCRA Corrective Action program to go beyond programmatic activity measures (e.g., reports received and approved, etc.) to track changes in the quality of the environment. The two EI developed to-date indicate the quality of the environment in relation to current human exposures to contamination and the migration of contaminated groundwater. An EI for non-human (ecological) receptors is intended to be developed in the future.

### **Definition of "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" EI**

A positive "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" EI determination ("YE" status code) indicates that the migration of "contaminated" groundwater has stabilized, and that monitoring will be conducted to confirm that contaminated groundwater remains within the original "area of contaminated groundwater" (for all groundwater "contamination" subject to RCRA corrective action at or from the identified facility (i.e., site-wide)).

### **Relationship of EI to Final Remedies**

While Final remedies remain the long-term objective of the RCRA Corrective Action program the EI are near-term objectives which are currently being used as Program measures for the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, GPRA). The "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" EI pertains ONLY to the physical migration (i.e., further spread) of contaminated ground water and contaminants within groundwater (e.g., non-aqueous phase liquids or NAPLs). Achieving this EI does not substitute for achieving other stabilization or final remedy requirements and expectations associated with sources of contamination and the need to restore, wherever practicable, contaminated groundwater to be suitable for its designated current and future uses.

#### **Duration / Applicability of EI Determinations**

EI Determinations status codes should remain in RCRIS national database ONLY as long as they remain true (i.e., RCRIS status codes must be changed when the regulatory authorities become aware of contrary information).

Page 2

2.	Is groundwater known or reasonably suspected to be "contaminated" above appropriately protective
	"levels" (i.e., applicable promulgated standards, as well as other appropriate standards, guidelines,
	guidance, or criteria) from releases subject to RCRA Corrective Action, anywhere at, or from, the facility?

If yes - continue after identifying key contaminants, citing appropriate "levels," and referencing supporting documentation.

X If no - skip to #8 and enter "YE" status code, after citing appropriate "levels," and referencing supporting documentation to demonstrate that groundwater is not "contaminated."

\_\_\_\_ If unknown - skip to #8 and enter "IN" status code.

Rationale and Reference(s): There have been no documented releases from any of the areas at the Facility to date. Prior to 1970, however, electroplating wastes were presumably discharged directly into the onsite pond. Wastes discharged to the pond at this time may have included copper, nickel, silver, rhodium, cyanide, trichloroethylene, dichloroethylene and vinyl chloride. In 1970, a wastewater treatment system was installed to treat electroplating wastewater. This system was tested, and passed the effluent requirements of the Pennsylvania Department of Health. The results of this test were as follows:

<u>Plating Rinse Water</u>		<b>Treated Rinse Water</b>
pН	3.2	11.2
Suspended solids	5 mg/l	<1 mg/l
Copper	5 mg/l	0.005 mg/l
Nickel	18 mg/l	0.25 mg/l
Cyanide		<0.026 mg/l

In April, 1972, the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) took two water samples, one from a ditch along the north end of the pond and one at the discharge point of the pond. All samples were found to be below current drinking water standards. The results of the analysis follow:

	Sample From Ditch	Sample From Pond Discharge	<b>Drinking Water</b>
			<b>Maximum</b>
			<b>Contaminant Levels</b>
Copper	1.08 mg/l	0.28 mg/l	1.3 mg/l
Zinc	0.12 mg/l	0.22 mg/l	5.0 mg/l
Chromium (total)	Not analyzed	0.06  mg/l	0.1  mg/l

In 1984, all plating operations at the Facility were removed, and the pond no longer received any process water from the Facility. At this time, the Facility requested permission from PADEP to drain and reshape the onsite pond. One composite sample of pond sludge was taken to determine if contamination was leaching from the pond bottom. This sample was analyzed for acid extractables, base neutrals, heavy metals, priority pollutant volatile organic compounds and EPA priority pesticides. Based on the results of this sampling, PADEP approved the facility's request, and the pond bottom was dredged and this material used to reshape the pond embankment.

Additional sampling of the pond bottom and embankment performed by Sunrise Medical in the Spring of 2000, further verified that no contaminants of concern are present in the pond above levels of concern. (See sampling results on following page) Based on this sampling, along with previous sampling results, the pond is not a potential contaminant source to groundwater beneath the Facility, and therefore, groundwater beneath the Facility is not expected to be contaminated. Today the pond receives only surface water runoff from the Facility, and is a habitat for several species of fish.

Footnotes: "Contamination" and "contaminated" describes media containing contaminants (in any form,

NAPL and/or

dissolved, vapors, or solids, that are subject to RCRA) in concentrations in excess of appropriate "levels" (appropriate for the protection of the groundwater resource and its beneficial uses).

3.	expected to remain within "existing area of contaminated groundwater" as defined by the monitoring locations designated at the time of this determination)?		
		If yes - continue, after presenting or referencing the physical evidence (e.g., groundwater sampling/measurement/migration barrier data) and rationale why contaminated groundwater is expected to remain within the (horizontal or vertical) dimensions of the "existing area of groundwater contamination" <sup>2</sup> ).	
		If no (contaminated groundwater is observed or expected to migrate beyond the designated locations defining the "existing area of groundwater contamination" <sup>2</sup> ) - skip to #8 and enter "NO" status code, after providing an explanation.	
		If unknown - skip to #8 and enter "IN" status code.	
	Rationale and Re	eference(s):	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> "existing area of contaminated groundwater" is an area (with horizontal and vertical dimensions) that has been verifiably demonstrated to contain all relevant groundwater contamination for this determination, and is defined by designated (monitoring) locations proximate to the outer perimeter of "contamination" that can and will be sampled/tested in the future to physically verify that all "contaminated" groundwater remains within this area, and that the further migration of "contaminated" groundwater is not occurring. Reasonable allowances in the proximity of the monitoring locations are permissible to incorporate formal remedy decisions (i.e., including public participation) allowing a limited area for natural attenuation.

4.	Does "contaminated" groundwater discharge into surface water bodies?		
	If yes - continue after identifying potentially affected surface water bodies.		
	If no - skip to #7 (and enter a "YE" status code in #8, if #7 = yes) after providing a explanation and/or referencing documentation supporting that groundwater "contamination" does not enter surface water bodies.		
	If unknown - skip to #8 and enter "IN" status code.		
	Rationale and Reference(s):		

5.	maximum concen appropriate groundischarging conta	of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water likely to be "insignificant" (i.e., the tration <sup>3</sup> of each contaminant discharging into surface water is less than 10 times their ndwater "level," and there are no other conditions (e.g., the nature, and number, of aminants, or environmental setting), which significantly increase the potential for pacts to surface water, sediments, or eco-systems at these concentrations)?
		If yes - skip to #7 (and enter "YE" status code in #8 if #7 = yes), after documenting: 1) the maximum known or reasonably suspected concentration <sup>3</sup> of <u>key</u> contaminants discharged above their groundwater "level," the value of the appropriate "level(s)," and if there is evidence that the concentrations are increasing; and 2) provide a statement of professional judgement/explanation (or reference documentation) supporting that the discharge of groundwater contaminants into the surface water is not anticipated to have unacceptable impacts to the receiving surface water, sediments, or eco-system.
		If no - (the discharge of "contaminated" groundwater into surface water is potentially significant) - continue after documenting: 1) the maximum known or reasonably suspected concentration of each contaminant discharged above its groundwater "level," the value of the appropriate "level(s)," and if there is evidence that the concentrations are increasing; and 2) for any contaminants discharging into surface water in concentrations greater than 100 times their appropriate groundwater "levels," the estimated total amount (mass in kg/yr) of each of these contaminants that are being discharged (loaded) into the surface water body (at the time of the determination), and identify if there is evidence that the amount of discharging contaminants is increasing.
		If unknown - enter "IN" status code in #8.
	Rationale and Re	ference(s):

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> As measured in groundwater prior to entry to the groundwater-surface water/sediment interaction (e.g., hyporheic) zone.

Page 6

6.

 ntil a final remedy decision can be made and implemented <sup>4</sup> )? If yes - continue after either: 1) identifying the Final Remedy decision incorporating the conditions, or other site-specific criteria (developed for the protection of the site's sur
water, sediments, and eco-systems), and referencing supporting documentation
demonstrating that these criteria are not exceeded by the discharging groundwater; Ol
2) providing or referencing an interim-assessment, <sup>5</sup> appropriate to the potential for
impact, that shows the discharge of groundwater contaminants into the surface water
(in the opinion of a trained specialists, including ecologist) adequately protective of
receiving surface water, sediments, and eco-systems, until such time when a full
assessment and final remedy decision can be made. Factors which should be conside
in the interim-assessment (where appropriate to help identify the impact associated wi
discharging groundwater) include: surface water body size, flow,
use/classification/habitats and contaminant loading limits, other sources of surface
water/sediment contamination, surface water and sediment sample results and
comparisons to available and appropriate surface water and sediment "levels," as well
any other factors, such as effects on ecological receptors (e.g., via bio-assays/benthic
surveys or site-specific ecological Risk Assessments), that the overseeing regulatory agency would deem appropriate for making the EI determination.
 If no - (the discharge of "contaminated" groundwater can not be shown to be "current
acceptable") - skip to #8 and enter "NO" status code, after documenting the currently
unacceptable impacts to the surface water body, sediments, and/or eco-systems.
 If unknown - skip to 8 and enter "IN" status code.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Note, because areas of inflowing groundwater can be critical habitats (e.g., nurseries or thermal refugia) for many species, appropriate specialist (e.g., ecologist) should be included in management decisions that could eliminate these areas by significantly altering or reversing groundwater flow pathways near surface water bodies.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> The understanding of the impacts of contaminated groundwater discharges into surface water bodies is a rapidly developing field and reviewers are encouraged to look to the latest guidance for the appropriate methods and scale of demonstration to be reasonably certain that discharges are not causing currently unacceptable impacts to the surface waters, sediments or eco-systems.

1.	necessary) be collected in the future to verify that contaminated groundwater has remained within the horizontal (or vertical, as necessary) dimensions of the "existing area of contaminated groundwater?"		
		If yes - continue after providing or citing documentation for planned activities or future sampling/measurement events. Specifically identify the well/measurement locations which will be tested in the future to verify the expectation (identified in #3) that groundwater contamination will not be migrating horizontally (or vertically, as necessary) beyond the "existing area of groundwater contamination."	
		If no - enter "NO" status code in #8.	
		If unknown - enter "IN" status code in #8.	
	Rationale and Re	ference(s):	

Page 8

- 8. Check the appropriate RCRIS status codes for the Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control EI (event code CA750), and obtain Supervisor (or appropriate Manager) signature and date on the EI determination below (attach appropriate supporting documentation as well as a map of the facility).
  - X YE Yes, "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater Under Control" has been verified. Based on a review of the information contained in this EI determination, it has been determined that the "Migration of Contaminated Groundwater" is "Under Control" at the Sunrise Medical Home Healthcare Group, Inc. (DeVilbis Company) facility, EPA ID # PAD 99 075 2537, located at 100 DeVilbis Drive, Somerset, PA 15501. Specifically, this determination indicates that the migration of "contaminated" groundwater is under control, and that monitoring will be conducted to confirm that contaminated groundwater remains within the "existing area of contaminated groundwater" This determination will be reevaluated when the Agency becomes aware of significant changes at the facility.

NO - Unacceptable migration of contaminated groundwater is observed or expected.

IN - More information is needed to make a determination.

Completed by (signature) Date: 11/14/00

Hilary Livingston

Remedial Project Manager

Supervisor (signature) Date: 11/14/00

Paul Gotthold

PA Operations Branch Chief

EPA, Region 3

### Locations where References may be found:

Facility RCRA Project File EPA, Region 3 1650 Arch Street Philadelphia, PA 19103-2029

### **Contact telephone and e-mail numbers:**

(name) Paul Gotthold (phone #) 215-814-3410

(e-mail) gotthold.paul@epa.gov